

Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0120763 to Volpano and U.S. Patent 6,452,910 to Vij et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection.

This invention relates to a bridge device for connecting a centralized wireless network to a plurality of other networks. Pertinent portions of Claim 1 are set forth below:

"Bridge device for connecting a centralized wireless network to a plurality of other networks, each of said other networks having devices which can communicate with each other"

Nowhere does Volpano teach or suggest this structure. In Volpano, a network which includes both wired and wireless LANs is split by a bridge 10 into separate networks which, for security purposes, do not communicate with each other. As a result, there is no centralized network, as claimed. Furthermore, nowhere does Volpano show or suggest that each of the other networks connected to a centralized network has devices which can communicate with each other, as specifically recited in Claim 1. Rather, Volpano sets up his system so that traffic among the various networks coupled to bridge 10 is segregated. See the Abstract of Volpano.

Furthermore, nowhere does Volpano show or suggest an access point adapted to manage a centralized wireless network and to associate with a wireless device to allow the wireless device to be a member of the centralized wireless network, to allow the

wireless device to communicate with other members of the centralized wireless network, as specifically recited in Claim 1. Pertinent portions of Claim 1 are set forth below:

"an access point adapted to manage the centralized wireless network and to associate with a wireless device to allow said wireless device to be a member of the centralized wireless network and to allow said wireless device to communicate with other members of the centralized wireless network"

Volpano does not teach or suggest a centralized wireless network, and does not have any access point adapted to manage the centralized wireless network and to associate with a wireless device to be a member of the centralized wireless network, all as recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that Volpano does not affect the patentability of the invention as defined by Claim 1.

The Examiner has asserted that Figure 1 of Volpano shows stations 16-24 which can communicate with each other. The Applicants can not agree. Volpano creates security barriers so that the various LANs can not communicate with each other, so as to improve the security of the system. In fact, this is the purpose of Volpano.

U.S. Patent 6,452,910 to Vij et al. shows a centralized wireless network in Figure 6. The wireless network uses a bridge to couple to a Bluetooth enabled vehicle module in a wireless vehicle link. Nowhere does Vij et al. show a bridge device for managing a plurality of ports for connecting to respective other networks, as specifically set forth in Claim 1, whose pertinent parts are set forth below:

"said bridge device comprising a bridge module for managing a plurality of ports for connecting to respective other networks".

Rather, in Vij et al. the wireless bridge couples the wireless site link only to a wireless vehicle link through a Bluetooth enabled vehicle module. Nowhere does Vij et al. show or suggest "other networks having devices which can communicate with each other", as specifically recited in Claim 1.

If the device of Vij et al. were to be combined with the device of Volpano, one of the VLAN networks of Volpano would be coupled to a wireless vehicle link through a wireless bridge. Even if Volpano were modified in this way, the modified device would not teach or suggest a "Bridge device for connecting a centralized wireless network to a plurality of other networks, each of said other networks having devices which can communicate with each other", as specifically recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that even if the teachings of Volpano and Vij et al. were to be combined, such a combination would not affect the patentability of the instant invention as defined by Claim 1.

Claims 2-9 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

The Examiner has additionally cited U.S. Patent 5,570,366 to Baker et al. against Claims 3-9. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider his rejection.

Baker relates to a communication system which includes high speed wired LANs and low speed wireless LANs. Baker provides a filter which removes unneeded messages from the wireless LAN so they do not impact the useful bandwidth of the

wireless network. Baker et al. teaches a bridge which connects a wired LAN to a wireless LAN. If the device of Baker et al. were to be combined with the apparatus of Volpano, a bridge would be used to couple a wireless network to either VLAN1 or VLAN2 of Volpano, or a bridge would be used to couple a wired network to VLAN3, VLAN4 or VLAN5 of Volpano. In either case, the combined apparatus would not teach or suggest a "Bridge device for connecting a centralized wireless network to a plurality of other networks, each of the other networks having devices which can communicate with each other,... and wherein the centralized wireless network comprises an access point adapted to manage the centralized wireless network and to associate with a wireless device to allow said wireless device to be a member of the centralized wireless network and to allow the wireless device to communicate with other members of the centralized wireless network", all as specifically recited in Claim 1.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that it is clear that even if the device of Volpano were to be combined with the devices of Vij et al. and Baker et al., the patentability of the instant invention, as defined by Claim 1, would not be affected.

The Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied upon by the Examiner. The Applicants submit that such art is no more relevant to the Applicant's invention than the art upon which the Examiner has relied.

The Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Serial No. 10/660,141
Customer No. 24498

PF030065

Respectfully submitted,

Sebastian Perrot et al.

By: Catherine A. Ferguson
Catherine A. Ferguson
Reg. No. 40,877
Tel. No. (609) 734-6440

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

November 17, 2006